abruptly is just not possible. We should pursue ways to clean it up. That includes sequestering carbon.

My State of Wyoming has the most advanced carbon sequestration laws in the country, which say that the pores under the surface where carbon can be sequestered—or captured and secured—belong to the surface owner, and that liability for the escape of hydrocarbons that are introduced into those pores are on the companies that put that carbon in the ground. So that creates a mechanism that other States are looking at right now, including Montana and others that are following Wyoming's lead.

In addition, we need to produce from coal liquid products that burn less. In addition, we need more nuclear energy. As we know, nuclear energy is not a carbon emitter, and it is producing 20 percent of our electricity now. So we absolutely cannot take nuclear energy off the table. It's very important that we add more nuclear.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, Congresswoman LUMMIS, what you're saying is really exciting. You're talking about what the Republicans have been pushing for now and since I've been here, which has been since 2001. It's an all-of-the-above strategy. It's saying let's let freedom work. Just get out of the way, and let's start developing hydrogen. If we've got places we ought to drill for oil, then do that. Fine. If we've got to do coal, let's figure out if you're going to sequester it or not. If we need nuclear and if you're really worried about that percentage of CO_2—I mean if you're really serious about that, then why not embrace the number 1 technology that doesn't make any CO_2, which is nuclear? We're saying do all of these things. Let the free marketplace work and let freedom basically run. Let American innovation—and let the resources that God gave us on this land—work, and we will have energy.

You know, there's an ironic thing that is just absolutely crazy about government. Do you know why the Department of Energy was created years and years ago? This is kind of a quiz question if any of my colleagues happen to know the answer. Why did we create the Department of Energy?

Dr. BROUN from Georgia, do you know why we created the Department of Energy?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Absolutely. It was created to make America energy independent.

Mr. AKIN. What has happened since we've created it, Congressman?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, it has not made America energy independent whatsoever.

Mr. AKIN. We are less that way.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. We are less.

Mr. AKIN. What has happened to the number of employees in the Department of Energy?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. It has skyrocketed. They're really not fulfilling the obligation that they have under the charter of developing the Department of Energy, so they've been an abject failure at what they were charged to do.

Mr. AKIN. In fact, you could almost say it's of inverse proportion. The more people they've hired and the bigger it has gotten, the more dependent we have become on foreign energy. That doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

I want to thank Congresswoman LUMMIS, and I also want to get back to Judge CARTER here.

I want to give you a chance to take a look at some of these things. We've got, I think, only just about another 5 minutes or so.

Mr. CARTER. First, if they're not doing their job, we ought to fire them. That's just really easy, okay?

Mr. AKIN. I think that was pretty straightforward. If they don't do the job, fire them.

Mr. CARTER. That's simple stuff. If they're not doing what we hired them to do, we've got to fire them.

Mr. AKIN. Now, Ronald Reagan wanted to close the department down.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. AKIN. Is that what you're advocating?

Mr. CARTER. That's fine. I don't have a problem with that at all, but let's get back to what we're doing.

You know, there's an old saying: ''I won't tax you and I won't tax me. I'll tax that fellow behind the tree,'' okay? That's kind of what we heard from the Obama administration when we started off: Don't worry. Ninety-five percent of the people in America are not going to be taxed by this administration. Yet, as my colleague from Georgia said, there's not anything you can think of that doesn't have an energy cost in it. Nothing. I mean it's in everything. So I don't care how rich you are or how poor you are. You're going to be taxed by this.

Now, don't give me the excuse of, well, we're just taxing the company, and they're taxing you. That doesn't work. Everybody knows where this tax is going. They know it in the administration, and we know it in Congress. It's going to us, to the individual Americans, and we're going to pay this tax. Look at that. Shoes. Plastic. Food. Electricity. Housing. All that.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, these are all different places. If you're going to have to use it up, it's going to cost you $1,900 per household just for the first year of this tax. This just tells you what you'd have to give up to save that money to pay that tax. This one here is all of the meat, poultry, fish, eggs, dairy products, fruits and vegetables that a family eats in 1 year.

□ 2030

That's what you've got to give up to compensate for this tax that's being proposed. Or, maybe you don't want to do that. You want to give up this—all furniture, appliances, carpet, and other furnishings. You can give that up for 1 year.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman would yield for just a minute. On that food thing, you have forgotten the next tax they're coming up with is the flatulence tax on cows.

Mr. AKIN. Are you going to collect that in bags, gentlemen?

Mr. CARTER. Ask our farmers if they like that idea.

Mr. AKIN. I think we're getting close on time, but the good news is my good friend, Congressman KING from Iowa, is here. I think he is going to continue talking on the same subject. I think he might be willing to recognize some of the other Congressmen that want to weigh in on this absolutely crazy sort of tax system that's being proposed.

The funny thing is that, just to conclude, this chart right here, this is something the Democrats have been unwilling to deal with or talk about. But, see this little card? There's a little plastic thing here and there's a thing inside there that's the size of two mechanical pencil erasers. There's enough nuclear energy in that little pill right there to equal 149 gallons of oil, 1 ton of coal, or 17,000 cubic feet of natural gas. That's how much energy is in that one little tablet. Maybe we ought to be thinking about real technology.

Thank you all for joining me this evening.

AMERICA'S ENERGY CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from Iowa is pleased to be recognized to address you tonight in this 60-minute period of time.

Having recognized that the gentleman from Missouri was in the middle of a statement, and having recognized that there were gentlemen here on the floor, along with the gentlewoman from Wyoming, that are still full of information that America needs to hear, Mr. Speaker, I will just simply set the stage with a very short piece of this—and that is that I think we need to have the smoothest of transitions from Special Order to Special Order, and that would require that I yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) who was in the middle of a statement when his 60-minute clock ran out.

Mr. AKIN. I thank you very much, gentlemen. Congressman KING is known for the Opportunity Society that he chairs. He brought in a speaker just a matter of a couple of weeks ago, an economist from Spain, talking about the exact same thing that's being proposed here in America. In fact, the President has referred to Spain as a great example of what we should do. And he informed us that it's a great example if you like 17½ percent unemployment.

What he described was—one of the things that was just amazing to me in terms of the contradiction that's involved was, they closed down nuclear